



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

10/735,628

12/16/2003

Roger M. Scott

07948-0035

2664

22852

7590

01/27/2006

FINNEGAN, HENDERSON, FARABOW, GARRETT & DUNNER
LLP

901 NEW YORK AVENUE, NW
WASHINGTON, DC 20001-4413

EXAMINER

VO, THANH DUC

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2189

DATE MAILED: 01/27/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/735,628	Applicant(s) SCOTT ET AL.	
	Examiner Thanh D. Vo	Art Unit 2189	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 16 December 2003.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-31 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-31 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 16 December 2003 is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☒ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>4/15/04; 2/10/05</u> | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

1. This Office Action is responsive to the Application filed on December 16, 2003.

This application benefits the priority data as of March 31, 2003 from a provisional application 60/458,427. Claims 1-53 are presented for examination.

Claims 1-53 are pending.

The IDS filed on April 15, 2004 and February 10, 2005 have been considered.

Drawings

2. Figures 1 and 2 should be designated by a legend such as --Prior Art-- because only that which is old is illustrated. See MPEP § 608.02(g). Corrected drawings in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121(d) are required in reply to the Office action to avoid abandonment of the application. The replacement sheet(s) should be labeled "Replacement Sheet" in the page header (as per 37 CFR 1.84(c)) so as not to obstruct any portion of the drawing figures. If the changes are not accepted by the examiner, the applicant will be notified and informed of any required corrective action in the next Office action. The objection to the drawings will not be held in abeyance.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

3. Claims 1-4, 6, 16-18, 19 and 21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Taylor (US Patent 5,530,232).

As to claims 1 and 16, Taylor disclosed a method for communicating data from a plurality of data sources to a plurality of data targets in a data processing system having a plurality of connection mechanisms for establishing logical connections between data sources and data targets, the method comprising:

selecting one of a plurality of applications associated with a first data source (col. 4, lines 44-47), wherein each of the plurality of data source applications has a plurality of data elements (col. 4, lines 49-56);

selecting one of a plurality of applications associated with a data target, wherein each of the plurality of data target applications has a plurality of data entry fields (see col. 4, line 57 – col. 5, line 24);

mapping/linking a data element from the first data source to a data entry field using a drag-and-drop operation (col. 5, lines 25-46); and

automatically associating a data element on a second data source corresponding to the mapped data element with the data entry field of the selected data target application (col. 5, line 25 – col. 6, line 36).

In addition to the indicated lines and columns from the reference above, the step of drag-and-drop or making it automatic is insignificant since making an operation manual or automatic is unpatentable.

Furthermore, the step of associating the data element from the source to the target is an inheritance feature in this field of invention since it is required by the system to correctly map the data and associate them accordingly to avoid any errors arises from mismatching the corresponded entries.

As to claims 2 and 17, Taylor disclosed a method further comprising copying a value stored in a data entry field to a data element associated with the second data source, provided the value stored in the data entry field has been mapped to the data element. See col. 5, line 25 – col. 6, line 36.

As to claims 3 and 18, Taylor disclosed a method, wherein mapping further comprises mapping a data element to a plurality of data entry fields, wherein the data element from the second data source is automatically associated with the plurality of data entry fields of the selected data target application. See col. 4, line 57 – col. 5, line 24, col. 5, lines 25-46, and col. 6.

As to claims 4 and 19, Taylor disclosed a method, wherein mapping further comprises the step of reading data from the first data source, transforms the data, and

Art Unit: 2189

writes to the selected data target application has been performed. See col. 4, line 44 – col. 5, line 54.

Further review indicates that a **script** is a software program that was previously programmed with the function of reading the data from the data source.

Noted that Taylor disclosed a method of reading the data from the data source. See col. 4, line 44 – col. 5, line 54.

Therefore, Taylor is inherently containing a program code (a script) in order to perform an equivalent task in the claim invention.

As to claims 6 and 21, Taylor disclosed a method, wherein the first data source is a smart card. See col. 3, lines 47-66.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. Claims 5, 7-15, and 20, and 22-31 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Taylor (U.S. Patent 5,530,232).

As to claims 5 and 20, although Taylor did not explicitly disclose a step of writing the transformed data to an output file when a previous mapping from the first data source to the selected data target application has not been performed.

However, it would have been obvious to one having an ordinary skill in the art to realize that the said step is a well-known method in the computer art and data communication since the updated data should be saved to an output file during the execution period or before the system is terminated in order to keep the newly updated data consistent with the information that was supposed to be updated. Therefore, it is obvious to one having an ordinary skill in the art at the time the applicant invention to realize that writing data to an output file is well known and unpatentable.

As to claims 7 and 22, although Taylor did not explicitly disclose the data target is a Microsoft Windows TM -based application. However, it would have been obvious to one having an ordinary skill in the art at the time of the applicant's invention to include the data target to be a Microsoft Windows TM – based application since Microsoft Windows TM Operation System is a well-known OS and being used widely over the world.

As to claims 8 and 23, although Taylor did not explicitly disclose the step of mapping further comprises storing data elements of the second data source in an output file when a previous mapping from the first data source to the selected data target application has not been performed.

However, it would have been obvious to one having an ordinary skill in the computer art at the time of the applicant's invention to realize that said step is a well-known method in the computer art and data communication method since the updated data should be saved to an output file during the execution period or before the system is terminated in order to keep the newly updated data consistent with the information that was supposed to be updated. Therefore, it is obvious to one having an ordinary skill in the art at the time the applicant invention to realize that writing data to an output file is well known and unpatentable.

As to claims 9 and 23, Taylor disclosed the step of storing data elements of the second data source in an output file which is a well-known method in the computer art and data communication method since the updated data should be saved to an output file during the execution period or before the system is terminated in order to keep the newly updated data consistent with the information that was supposed to be updated.

Therefore, it is obvious to one having an ordinary skill in the art at the time the applicant invention to realize that writing data to an output file is well known and unpatentable.

As to claims 10, 25, and 31, Taylor disclosed a method for communicating data from a plurality of data sources to a plurality of data targets in a data processing system having a plurality of connection mechanisms for establishing logical connections between data sources and data targets, the method comprising:

reading data from a data source (col. 4, lines 14-19);

if the read data has been mapped to a data entry field associated with a data target application using a drag-and-drop operation, associating the read data with the data entry field (col. 5, lines 25-46); and

Taylor failed to disclose a method of storing the read data in an output file.

However, it would have been obvious to one having an ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's invention to realize that if the read data has not been mapped to a data entry field associated with a data target application using a drag-and-drop operation, storing the read data in an output file. The advantage of storing the output file if the data has not been mapped is to secure the data input from being lost since the data entries have not showed up at the display with the drag-and-drop operation.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having an ordinary skill in the art at the time of the applicant's invention to modify the system of Taylor to combine with the method of storing the read data to an output file while the read data has not been mapped.

As to claims 11 and 26, Taylor disclosed a method, wherein associating further comprises associating the read data with a plurality-of data entry fields corresponding to the data target application. See col. 5, line 25 – col. 6, line 36.

As to claims 12 and 27, Taylor disclosed method, wherein the data source is a smart card. See col. 3, lines 47-66.

As to claims 13, 14, 28, and 29, the output file is a text file (claims 13 and 28) or hypertext markup language file (claims 14 and 29) are well-known and useful file formats in computer art at the time of the applicant's invention since either file can easily change their extensions to .html or backward to .txt while avoiding any accidental lost of data. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having an ordinary skill in the art at the time of the applicant's invention to combine the method of claims 13, 14, 28, and 29 into the system of Taylor to arrive at the invention of claims 13, 14, 28, and 29, respectively.

As to claims 15 and 30, although Taylor did not explicitly disclosed the data target is a Microsoft Windows TM -based application. However, it would have been obvious to one having an ordinary skill in the art at the time of the applicant's invention to include the data target to be a Microsoft Windows TM – based application since Microsoft Windows TM Operation System is a well-known OS and being used widely over the world.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Thanh D. Vo whose telephone number is (571) 272-0708. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 9AM-5:30PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Matthew Kim can be reached on (571) 272-4182. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.


Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).



Thanh D. Vo

01/23/2006

Patent Examiner



TUAN V. THAI
PRIMARY EXAMINER